UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,766	03/26/2004	Geoffrey R. Kruse	M61.12-0629	9088

27366 7590 04/06/2007 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319	EXAMINER CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/810,766	KRUSE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 December 2006</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,4-18 and 20-23</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 4-18 and 20-23</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to Amendment filed on 12/26/2006.

2.   Claims 1 and 18 have been amended, claims 2, 3 and 19 have been canceled, and claims

21-23 have been added. Currently, claims 1, 4-18 and 20-23 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-18 and 20-23 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5.   Claims 1, 4-18 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

claimed invention.

Regarding claims 1, 18 and 21, the limitation "tangible medium" is not defined in the

Specification, thereby the metes and bounds of a tangible medium are unclear. Instead of

"tangible medium", "computer storage medium" can be used (see Specification, page 6).

Claims 4-17, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claims 1, 18

and 21 upon which they depend respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

4.   Claims 1, 4-17 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention

is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 1, this claim is for a system. However, all of the elements claimed

could be reasonably interpreted in light of the disclosure by an ordinary artisan as being software

alone, and thus is directed to software *per se*, which is non-statutory

In order for such a software claim to be statutory, it must be claimed in combination with

an appropriate medium and/or hardware to establish a statutory category of invention and enable

any functionality to be realized. Applicant's amendment, "A computer system that includes

components stored on a tangible medium, the components comprising:", defines the claimed

limitations as components stored in some tangible medium wherein ONLY "components" NOT

"tangible medium" is a claimed limitation of the system. A system claim should be a

combination of software and hardware limitations. In addition, tangible medium is not defined

in the specification and subject to non-statutory medium; instead of "tangible medium",

"computer storage medium" should be used (see Specification, page 6).

Claims 4-17 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 1 upon which they

depend.

Regarding claim 21, this claim is rejected based on the same analysis as given above to

claim 1.

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 21 upon which

they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1, 4-18 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Thompson et al. (US Patent No 6,668,253).

        As to claim 1, Thompson et al. teach:

"A computer system that includes components stored on a tangible medium" (see Abstract), the

components comprising:

        "a uniform interface configured to receive a generalized request from a report object and,

based upon information included in the generalized request, access data from a general ledger

database and return the accessed data to the report object" (see [column 2, lines 17-20], [column

5, lines 44-55], [column 11, lines 30-40], [column 25, lines 23-33], [column 26, lines 22-55] and

[column 31, lines 35-65] wherein request for a report from the financial consolidation application

is equivalent to Applicant's "generalized request", and the transformation and staging server acts

as a uniform interface as claimed),

        "wherein at least one staging table having a standardized structure which is independent

of a structure of the general ledger database, is utilized by the uniform interface to store at least a

portion of the accessed data" (see [column 5, lines 50-56] wherein the transformation and staging

server includes staging table and [column 3, lines 19-22] and [column 25, lines 22-67] for

loading Financial Consolidation Database wherein Financial Consolidation Database can be

consider as staging database which is loaded and consolidated with data form General Ledger

database to create reports through the financial consolidate application; also see [column 26,

lines 23-65]).

"wherein the uniform interface is further configured to access the data from the general

ledger database by translating the generalized request into a specific query which, upon

execution, populates the at least one staging table with the accessed data" (see [column 31, lines

30-50]) for translating a user request into specific query to access requested data from a database

and see [column 25, lines 25-40] and [column 27, lines 32-40] for loading staging or temporary

table with consolidated financial information from data accessed from the General Ledger

database).

"wherein the uniform interface is further configured to query the at least one staging table

to retrieve the accessed data and to return the accessed data to the report object after execution of

the specific query that populates the at least one staging table" (see [column 3, lines 12-25],

[column 26, lines 54-60], [column 27, lines 20-25] and [column 32, lines 1-7]).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the at least one staging table is an account code table" (see [column 25, lines

44-47] for Account Tables).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein at least one staging table is an account balance staging table" (see [column 25,

lines 60-65] for Financial Account Balance Table).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the at least one staging table is a column filter staging table" (see [column 11,

lines 9-12] for a list of predefined query filters which is equivalent to Applicant's "column filter

staging table").

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the generalized request includes at least one natural account is translated into at

least one account code, which is stored in an account balance staging table" (see Fig. 25A for

account sequence which is equivalent to Applicant's "account code").

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 7

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the specific query, into which the generalized request is translated by the

uniform interface, comprises a single sequential query language (SQL) statement that joins the

account staging table with a balance table of the general ledger database, such that balance

information for an entire report column can be retrieved by execution of the single SQL

statement" (see [column 31, lines 35-60]).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the balance information comprises current balance amounts for each account

code in the account staging table" (see [column 25, lines 60-65] wherein each of GL accounts is

equivalent to Applicant's "account code" and account balances is equivalent to Applicant's

"balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for balance amount item).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the balance information comprises year-to-date balance amounts for each

account code in the account staging table" (see [column 30-35 and 60-65] wherein each of GL

accounts is equivalent to Applicant's "account code" and account balances is equivalent to

Applicant's "balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for EOY beginning balance and EOY ending

balance which is equivalent to Applicant's "year-to-date balance").

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the generalized request further comprises account filter criteria, and wherein a WHERE clause of the single SQL statement is configured to include the account filter criteria" (see [column 10, lines 1-15 and 40-45] and [column 26, lines 30-40 for the function of filtering information including financial information).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the generalized request includes at least one natural account and account filter criteria, and wherein, with the help of the uniform interface, the at least one natural account is translated into at least one account code, which is stored in an account balance staging table, and wherein account codes that match the account filter criteria are stored in a column filter staging table" (see Fig. 25A for account sequence which is equivalent to Applicant's "account code", and see [column 11, lines 9-15] and [column 10, lines 1-15] for filtering information and see [column 25, lines 20-60] and Fig. 25A for account number which is equivalent to Applicant's "natural account" and account sequence which is equivalent to Applicant's "account code").

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 12 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the specific query, into which the generalized request is translated by the uniform interface, comprises a single sequential query language (SQL) statement that joins the account staging table with the column filter staging table and with a balance table of the general ledger database, such that balance information for an entire report column can be retrieved by execution of the single SQL statement" (see [column 26, lines 30-45] and [column 31, lines 35-45] for ability to combine the financial information which is equivalent to Applicant's "joins").

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the balance information comprises current balance amounts for each account code in the account staging table" (see [column 25, lines 30-35 and 60-65] wherein each of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant's "account code" and account balances is equivalent to Applicant's "balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for balance amount item).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the balance information comprises year-to-date balance amounts for each account code in the account staging table" (see [column 30-35 and 60-65] wherein each of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant's "account code" and account balances is equivalent to

Applicant's "balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for EOY beginning balance and EOY ending

balance which is equivalent to Applicant's "year-to-date balance").

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the at least one staging table is a temporary table" (see [column 25, lines 15-17]

wherein a Summary Temporary Table is a temporary staging table).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the at least one staging table is a permanent table" (see [column 25, lines 17-22]

wherein a Summary (permanent) Table is a permanent staging table).

As to claim 18, Thompson et al. teach:

"A computer implemented method of retrieving data, from a general ledger database, to satisfy a

generalized request from a report object" (see [column 25, lines 20-30] and [column 26, lines 40-

45] wherein each report is equivalent to Applicant's "report object"), comprising:

"receiving the generalized request from the report object" (see [column 31, lines 35-40]

wherein request for information is equivalent to Applicant's "generalized request");

"accessing, based on information included in the generalized request, data from the

general ledger database" (see [column 25, lines 20-30], [column 26, lines 40-45] and [column 31,

lines 35-40] for General Ledger information and each Financial report is equivalent to

Applicant's "report object"),

"utilizing at least one staging table, having a standardized structure which is independent

of a structure of the general ledger database, to store at least a portion of the accessed data on a

tangible medium before it is returned to the report object from the staging table" (see [column

27, lines 22-25] for summary (financial) temporary tables (as staging table) storing consolidated

financial information; also see [column 2, lines 17-20] and [column 3, lines 19-22] wherein

financial database used by the financial consolidation application which contains consolidated

and summarized financial information from General Ledger database can be considered as

staging database including staging tables).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the at least one staging table is a temporary table" (see [column 25, lines 15-17]

wherein a Summary Temporary Table is a temporary staging table).

As to claim 21, Thompson et al. teaches:

"A computer system that includes components stored on a tangible medium" (see Abstract), the

components comprising:

"a uniform interface configured to receive a generalized request from a report object and, based upon information included in the generalized request, access data from at least one staging table that stores information from a single general ledger database on a tangible medium," (see [column 2, lines 17-20], [column 5, lines 44-55], [column 11, lines 30-40], [column 25, lines 23-33], [column 26, lines 22-55] and [column 31, lines 35-65] wherein request for a report from the financial consolidation application is equivalent to Applicant's "generalized request", and the transformation and staging server acts as a uniform interface as claimed; also see [column 2, lines 17-20] and [column 3, lines 19-22] wherein financial database used by the financial consolidation application which contains consolidated and summarized financial information from General Ledger database can be considered as staging database including staging tables [column 27, lines 20-25]),

"wherein the at least one staging table has a standardized structure which is independent of a structure of the general ledger database" (see [column 26, lines 30-40] and [column 27, lines 20-25] wherein summary (financial) temporary tables contained consolidated financial information must have a structure different from the structure of the general ledger database).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the at least one staging table is a permanent staging table" (see [column 25, lines 17-22] wherein a Summary (permanent) Table is a permanent staging table).

As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Thompson et al. teaches:

"wherein the permanent staging table is updated by one of SQL statements and database

functions, which are activated each time the general ledger database is updated" (see [column 15,

lines 25-30], [column 17, lines 23-30] and [column 28, lines 40]).

c

Conclusion

4.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC

March 29, 2007

JEAN M. CORNIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
post unit 2162